



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the eighteenth year of that king. Hilprecht, who placed the end of the Isin dynasty in the seventeenth year of Sin-muballiṭ and assigned Rim-Sin's capture of that city to the same year, was nearer to the truth than any of us.

The second part of the author's monograph is a short epitome of the date lists published by Scheil, Hilprecht, and Poebel. The dynastic tablet published by Scheil in the *Comptes Rendus* of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1911 (pp. 606 ff.) is reproduced in form of a new copy.¹ Thureau-Dangin finds only a few corrections to Scheil's copy. *Ur-ur* for *Ur-sag*, third king of the Akšak (Opis) dynasty. *I-mu-^aŠamaš* is the name of the seventh king at Kiš. For *Na-zi-ja-aḥ* he reads *Na-zi-ja zadim*. In a note on the dynasty of Agade he defends the order "Sargon, Maništusu, . . . Urumuš, Naram-Sin, Šarkališarri," etc. He dates the era of Gutium 2622-2498 and the beginning of the Ur dynasty at 2474, the earliest approximately certain date in the history of Sumer and Accad. He dates Naram-Sin 2755-2712, or one thousand years later than the date assigned to him by Nabonidus. In addition to the valuable historical information contained in this monograph the author's profound philological commentary is a contribution to Assyriology.

S. LANGDON

OXFORD, ENGLAND

A NEW GUIDE TO JUDGES

Dr. Burney has made a genuine contribution to the literature on Judges.² The author needs make no apology for his product. In its approach to the interpretation of Judges it is the most genuinely historical commentary upon the market. Perhaps its most valuable single item is the long section of the Introduction devoted to the external information bearing upon the period of the Judges. This is no reflection upon the merits of other commentaries, for the materials rendering a commentary like this possible have become available in full only within very recent years. The Book of Judges is a collection of documents of the greatest value for the understanding of the course of Hebrew history during the period of the "conquest" and settlement of Canaan. No book of the Old Testament better repays the student of history for the labor expended upon it. Burney's commentary not only explains the details of the text in so far as they are now explicable, but it also points out the historical problems to which the text gives rise and offers many helpful suggestions toward their solution.

¹ This tablet is now in the British Museum; see King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition*, p. 27.

² *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes*. By C. F. Burney, London: Rivingtons, 1918. Pp. cxxviii+528. 21s.

On the literary analysis of Judges, Burney accepts the more recent view that the J and E of the Hexateuch are continued in Judges; but he reconstructs the later history of the documents in his own way. Thus J and E were combined by R^{JE} about 700 B.C.; the framework of the book usually assigned to R^D is rather the work of R^{E2}, which was done about 650 B.C.; and the final touches to the material were given by R^P. It is rather surprising that R^D who operated freely on the preceding portions of J and E which appear in the Hexateuch and also upon the corresponding material which follows in Samuel should have passed over JE in Judges leaving it untouched.

The discussion of the *Ḥabiru* in relation to the Hebrews is comprehensive and in the main convincing. It is perhaps a bit venturesome to say that "the philological equivalence of (*amēlātū*) *Ḥabiru* with עִבְרִי, *ibhrî*, 'Hebrew'—or rather with עִבְרִי—is perfect. About this there can be no doubt at all" (p. lxiv). In view of the writing *ḥa-ab-bi-ru* it is probable that the word is a *Ḳaṭṭil*-form from which עִבְרִי could never have come, as has been pointed out by Dr. Luckenbill.¹ The objection to the equivalence of *Y-š-p-ā-ra* and יִשְׁכָּנֶאֱל based upon the lack of correspondence in the sibilants (p. lxviii) is not very forceful; for there is great variety in the equivalence of sibilants within the Semitic group itself and scarcely less when Egyptian and Semitic are compared. The equivalence of Egyptian *š* and Semitic *š* was pointed out by me in the January issue of this *Journal*.² That Egyptian *š* might be rendered by Semitic *s* is shown by such cases as Assyrian *sēni* for Eg. *šnw*, *Susinku* for *Ššnk*, and *Kūsi* for *kšš*.³ To call in question the legitimacy of the objection to the exchange of sibilants is, of course, not necessarily to adopt the reading "Joseph-el," but only to make it a trifle less dubious. Professor Burney's attempt to make Gideon's ephod into a harmless priestly apron can hardly be considered convincing, notwithstanding the plausibility of his arguments considered each on its merits. But the cumulative force of the objections to the apron interpretation is too great. Perhaps he would be willing to accept the ark as a substitute for the ephod, as W. R. Arnold has recently proposed.⁴ The old argument for the occurrence of the name "Yahweh" in early Babylonia is cited approvingly by Burney in his attempt to make Yahweh an Amorite deity (pp. 243 ff.). But this argument has recently been traversed by Dr. Luckenbill⁵ and needs a thorough rehabilitation in order to be effective. However, not to confine myself to fault finding, it

¹ See *American Journal of Theology*, XXII (1918), 37.

² "The name Moses," *AJSL*, XXXV, 110 f., where the reference number in line 23 on p. 112 should be corrected to Art. Inst. 94. 374.

³ Cited by Ranke, *Keilschrift, Material zur Altägyptischen Vokalisation* (1910), p. 92.

⁴ W. R. Arnold, *The Ephod and Ark* (1918).

⁵ *American Journal of Theology*, XXII, 47 ff.

is certainly a move in the right direction when Dr. Burney declares his conviction that much of the material of the Covenant Code is of very early, indeed pre-Mosaic, origin (pp. 330 f.). This view has been inevitable since the discovery of the Hammurabi Code and the large dependence of the Covenant Code thereon. My own opinion to that effect was expressed in this *Journal* (XXXII [1916], 87-92).

Few commentaries are so packed with information as this one. Hence the reader learns much from it even when occasionally he cannot accept its findings.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO